

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
for the
District of New Mexico

FILED
U.S. DISTRICT COURT
DISTRICT OF NEW MEXICO
2022 DEC -5 PM 4:52
CLERK-LAS CRUCES

minister demar-lashun: bey, authorized representative and beneficiary for DEMARIO LASHUN HANKINS ESTATE/CESTUI QUE VIE TRUST (National of the United States of America, native Tennessean, non-citizen, non-resident, non-subject, People of the United States of America)

Plaintiff/Petitioner

v.

STATE OF NEW MEXICO, private corporation, foreign to the United States Republic
DEMING MAGISTRATE, private corporation, foreign to the United States Republic
Isabel G. Orona d/b/a Court Manager for DEMING MAGISTRATE, Foreign, Hispanic female
Rene Afe Gaona d/b/a NEW MEXICO STATE POLICE, Foreign Agent, Hispanic male
Daniel Evans d/b/a NEW MEXICO POLICE SERGEANT, Foreign Agent, European male
Ray W. Baese d/b/a DEMING MAGISTRATE, Foreign Agent, Hispanic male

Defendant(s)/Respondent(s)

Civil Action Number: 22-cv-928

LEGAL NOTICE OF REMOVAL AND CIVIL SUIT
FROM MAGISTRATE COURT TO FEDERAL COURT
PROPER ARTICLE III JURISDICTION

PACI SUNT MAXIME CONTRARIA VIS ET INIURIA

Petitioner / Alleged Accused,

(Hereinafter Petitioner)

Official Notice is hereby served on LUNA COUNTY I – MAGISTRATE COURT (DEMING MAGISTRATE), STATE OF NEW MEXICO, et al Defendants; all Judicial Sub-Divisions; Officials and Agents that Jurisdiction / Venue is hereby moved to Federal Court. All Matters, Complaints, Civil Traffic Tickets / Civil Suits, Civil Citations / Bills of Exchange (misrepresented as lawful warrants, et cetera.), must be filed with Federal Court, pursuant to Jurisdiction named hereinafter.

JURISDICTION

Diversity of Citizenship. This court has jurisdiction due to the diversity of citizenship between the parties as stated in 28 USC 1332 as the matter in this civil controversy and counter claim exceeds 75,000\$ to be redeem in lawful money. The district court have original jurisdiction of all civil actions arising under the Constitution, laws, or treaties of the United States pursuant to 28 USC 1331-Federal Question for Constitutional violations by the above Defendants as outlined hereinafter. The district courts shall have original jurisdiction of any action in the nature of

mandamus to compel an officer or employee of the United States or any agency thereof to perform a duty owed to the plaintiff pursuant to 28 USC 1361.

Jurisdiction / Venue is hereby placed in one Supreme Court, pursuant to Article III Section 2 for The United States Republic, and the several States, under the Constitution; Article VI; and reaffirmed by obligatory Official Oaths.

“The Judicial Power shall extend to all cases, in law and equity, arising under this Constitution, the laws of the United States, and treaties made, or which shall be made, under their authority; --to all cases affecting ambassadors, other public ministers and consuls -- to all cases of admiralty and maritime jurisdictions.....”
In all cases affecting ambassadors, other public ministers and consuls, and those in which a state shall be a party, the Supreme Court shall have original jurisdiction. In all the other cases before mentioned, the Supreme Court shall have appellate jurisdiction...”

Petitioner

i, minister demar-lashun: bey, in propria persona, sui juris, aboriginal, indigenous 1828 american of moorish descent, at care of 2311 Ranch Club Road #179, [Silver City Territory, New Mexico] Republic, Zip Exempt.

i, minister demar-lashun: bey, freehold by inheritance with inalienable God-giving rights, protected and secured, makes with this NOTICE OF REMOVAL of the unconstitutional Complaint – Summons / Ticket – Civil Suit / Bill of Exchange / Civil Action Number: **M-34-TR-202201658**. Petitioner is with reasonable expectation that the Officers / Agents, and Officials, holding any position of Public Trust, or political office, are prohibited, under Official Oath, under the authority of The Law of the Land, from the use of the official position(s) or office(s) to violate the Constitution for the UNITED STATES OF AMERICA; and thus, by the abuse of authority, abuse of discretion and the practice of superseding their ‘limited’ jurisdictional powers, violate and abridge the Natural, Divine, Inalienable, Secured and God-giving Rights of the People; terminating with the cause of damage to this Petitioner / Plaintiff.

COMES NOW, minister demar-lashun: bey, possessing free-hold by inheritance status; standing squarely affirmed and bound to the Zodiac Constitution, with all due respect and honors given to the Constitution for the United States Republic, North America. Being a descendant and heir of the Creators of civilization and reincarnated at North America, with the blood of the ancient Moabites from the land of moab, who received permission from the pharaohs of Egypt to settle and inhabit North-West Africa / North Gate. The aboriginal and indigenous people are the founders and are the true possessors of the present moroccan empire; with our Canaanite, Hittite and Amorite brethren, who sojourned from the land of Canaan, seeking new homes. Our dominion and inhabitation extended from Northeast and Southwest Africa, across the Great Atlantis, even unto the present North, South and Central America and the Adjoining Islands-bound squarely affirmed to THE TREATY OF PEACE AND FRIENDSHIP OF SEVENTEEN HUNDRED AND EIGHTY-SEVEN (1787)/(1836) A.D. between Morocco and the United States (<https://founders.archives.gov/documents/Jefferson/01-10-02-0292>) the same as displayed under Treaty Law, Obligation, Authority as expressed in Article VI of the Constitution for the United States of America (Republic):

THE TREATY OF PEACE AND FRIENDSHIP OF 1836 A.D.
Between Morocco and the United States

Article 20

"If any of the Citizens of the United States, or any Persons under their Protection, shall have any disputes with each other, the Consul shall decide between the Parties, and whenever the Consul shall require any Aid or Assistance from our Government, to enforce his decisions, it shall be immediately granted to him."

Article 21

"If any Citizen of the United States should kill or wound a Moor, or, on the contrary, if a Moor shall kill or wound a Citizen of the United States, the Law of the Country shall take place, and equal Justice shall be rendered, the Consul assisting at the Trial; and if any Delinquent shall make his escape, the Consul shall not be answerable for him in any manner whatever."

CAUSE OF ACTION

The Petitioner / minister demar-lashun: bey while peacefully traveling, exercising my religion, and not conducting commerce at LUNA COUNTY territory, New Mexico Republic was unlawfully placed into detention and false imprisonment without Miranda Rights being read by Policemen / Alleged Prosecutors / Witnesses / Alleged Injured Party(ies) by Policy Enforcers Rene Afe Gaona, Badge I.D. Number 259 and Code Enforcer Daniel Evans; employed by the STATE OF NEW MEXICO whom stated that minister demar-lashun: bey was in violation of statute 66-5-229C and statute 66-07-351 which are private for-profit policies (being classed as law).

LUNA COUNTY I – MAGISTRATE COURT is an unconstitutional, private corporation, not delegated by Congress, under Article III, Section 2 of the Constitution; and that the Officers does not, and did not provide 'Due Process' protected and secured for the People, by the Amendments IV, V, VI, VII, VIII, IX, and X of the Constitution For the United States, to which the Judges and Officers in every State is bound (by Official Oath) and bond (*or should be*) to support and to uphold. Any statutory regulation, ordinance, or laws of any State, to the contrary, *notwithstanding*.

I do not waive any Inalienable God-giving Rights to due process; and affirmed that any action be adjudicated in a lawfully delegated jurisdiction and venue.

The Policy Enforcers of the STATE OF NEW MEXICO commanded that the Petitioner Pay Fines and Costs Imposed under threat, duress, and coercion with a 'man-of-straw' / misnomer word, misrepresented as implying my title, and typed upon the frivolous and fraudulent Order / Instrument, and was improperly spelled, "HANKINS DEMARIO LASHUN" in ALL CAPITAL LETTERS. That misnomer and CORPORATE - NAME, "HANKINS DEMARIO LASHUN" is clearly (an artificial – person / entity); is not me, the flesh and blood living son of The Most High – Almighty God; is a deliberate grammatical error, intended for injury to me; and is clearly not of consanguine relationship to me or to my nationality, in any form, truth, or manner; nor to my moorish, aboriginal and indigenous tribal bloodline. This is a repeated violation of my secured God-giving rights to my title and nationality; a violation of International Law; and a violation of the Obligations of the Officers of the Court; and a violation of their fiduciary trustee duties and Official Oaths and bonds to uphold and to support Article VI of the United States Constitution; and thus, violating my Substantive Rights, and United Nations Declaration on the Rights of Indigenous People: "Indigenous People have the right to a full and effective enjoyment of all human rights and fundamental freedoms recognized in the Charter of the United Nations; The Universal Declaration of Human Rights; And International Human Law."

Article 5 of the Rights of Indigenous People

Article 15 Everyone has the right to a nationality. No one shall be arbitrarily deprived of his nationality nor denied the right to change his nationality.

This Petitioner, once again made a “Reservation of Rights” as stated on the ticket / summon / civil suit/complaint No. **M-34-TR-202201658** and signed for the record under threat, duress, and coercion (UTDC).

Defendants are with the ‘want of jurisdiction’ by knowingly and willingly conspiring (under a Color-of-Authority) to deny this Petitioner, minister demar-lashun: bey, (after this Petitioner made a reservation of rights, returned and rescinded their offer to contract, and stated for the record; my title, correct words of art of my title, and national status and allegiance), Inalienable Rights, the right to a Title [Name] and Nationality of my choosing, et cetera. I have the unlimited right, **not** to be identified by the STATE or any fictitious entity. The STATE / Magistrate / Accuser(s), has alleged and assumed the Petitioner of being a U.S. CITIZEN, Corporate Ward-ship 14th Amendment Artificial Negro PERSON / Subject, which has resulted in an unlawful arrest-of-rights, immunities and liberties; a ‘lien’ on my ESTATE/TRUST, which is in direct contradiction to, and a violation of, the Fourth (IV) Amendment of the Constitution for the United States (Republic); violating Article VI of the Constitution, by way of violating The Treaty of Peace and Friendship of EIGHTEEN HUNDRED-THRITY-SIX (1836) A.D.; Congressional Resolution #75, Philadelphia Pennsylvania; a violation of Article 15 of ‘The Universal Declaration of Human Rights’ of Nineteen Hundred and Forty-Eight (1948) A.D. – General Assembly, United Nations; a violation of ‘The Declaration of the Rights of The Child’ of Nineteen Hundred and Fifty-Nine(1959)A.D(<https://www.ohchr.org/en/resources/educators/human-rights-education-training/1-declaration-rights-child-1959>); and violating ‘The Rights of Indigenous Peoples’; and that the Policy Enforcers of THE STATE OF NEW MEXICO and Sheriff knowingly committed ‘fraud’ against the Petitioner (minister demar-lashun: bey) by abusing their authority, in that they failed to correct a known violation; and did not aid in preventing said abuse of authority, while having (by law) the obligation to do so; and violated the Fifth Amendment of The Bill of Rights of Seventeen Hundred and Ninety-One (1791) A.D.; impeding the Peoples’ **right to due process under the Law, and equal protection of the Law**, Article 1 Section 10 of The Constitution for The United States of America (Republic) which secures the Petitioner the unlimited right to contract, and to halt all conspiracies to commit fraud against the Petitioner and against the United States of America (Republic).

CONCLUSION

1. The Petitioner claims full and equal protection of the Law in *Marbury v. Madison* 5 US 137 – “The Constitution of the United States is the Supreme Law of the Land. Any law, that is repugnant to the Constitution, **is null and void.**”
2. The unconstitutional statute being applied to the Petitioner are repugnant to the Constitution because they deny a right established and guaranteed in the 1st, 4th, 5th, 6th, 7th, 8th, 9th, and 10th Amendments, and in United States Supreme Court ‘**Stare Decisis**’ as further noted below, as where DEMING MAGISTRATE has **no authority** to adjudicate to the contrary.
3. The Defendant(s), (a court of limited jurisdiction), lacks the power to act and have proceeded beyond the strictures of the statutes (ultra vires), and that the statutes being applied are created from revised statutes and codes of a foreign and unidentified source, as they fail to show from what authority in law they exist, where they fail to show on their face, the mandatory enacting clause.

4. Said revised statutes and codes fail to show a necessary and mandatory enacting clause on their face, giving them lawful force and effect. Said revised statutes and codes are private codes and statutes and are not law, do not compel this Petitioner to perform and do not apply to him, and fail to show "authority for the court to make any order." Levy. Industrial Common Ibid, Midland Coal Co. v. Knox County, Ibid.
5. The Petitioner is not subject to the jurisdiction of the above Defendant(s), have challenged jurisdiction of the Defendant(s), yet they have failed to show for the record subject matter and personal jurisdiction (See attached "Challenging Jurisdiction/Declaratory Judgment").
6. The Petitioner have **no contracts and/or compacts** with LUNA COUNTY I – MAGISTRATE COURT, or with the STATE OF NEW MEXICO; or with any other segment of the United States of America that can grant jurisdiction over my God-giving inalienable rights; or over political, economic, social and cultural rights of aboriginal and indigenous men and women.
7. The STATE OF NEW MEXICO through its commercial agencies, on the Drivers License, and other misrepresented Instruments, has committed 'fraud' to accomplish what is called in legal contemplation, "Capitis Diminutio Maxima", which is that my natural title [name], giving by my Creator has been murdered and I was resurrected as a non-natural, created entity subject to regulation and denied the protections of national and international law. This constitutes Fraud and denies due process of the law and the Freedom from the Practices and Policies of Apartheid described in the International Convention on the Suppression and Punishment of the Crime of *Apartheid* Adopted and opened for signature, ratification by General Assembly resolution 3068 (XXVIII) of 30 November 1973 at Articles 1, 2 and 3, and the right not to be compelled to perform under any contract or agreement not entered into **voluntarily, intentionally and knowingly.**
8. Note that the presiding judge, and any judge acting as organ of the court, is aware that the Constitution(s) requires the person(s) adjudicating legal processes, to correct wrongs, and that their failure to correct the wrongs that were addressed constitutes Fraud under Rule 9(b) of the FRCP, cross referenced to 28 USC 1746, and that this Fraud constitutes Perjury and subornation on the Oath of Office at 18 USC 1621, deprives us of rights at 18 USC 241 and 242, Conspires to deprive rights at 42 USC 1985; is an extortion of rights at 18 USC 872, and is actionable under 42 USC 1983.
9. This court shall take mandatory Judicial Notice of the adjudged decision of the Supreme Court of the United States of Bradley v. Fisher 80 U.S. 335 (1871), 351, 352 that officers of the court have **no immunity** when they have no jurisdiction over the subject-matter. And further in Bradley v. Fisher on page 352, and 352 is as follows: "*Where there is clearly no jurisdiction over the subject matter any authority exercised is a usurped authority, and for the exercise of such authority, when the want of jurisdiction is known to the judge, no excuse is permissible.*"
10. Either subject-matter jurisdiction exists, or it does not. Subject-matter jurisdiction has been challenged; it must be proven by the party claiming that the court has subject-matter jurisdiction (complainant) as to all of the requisite elements of subject-matter jurisdiction.
11. "Petitioner asserts "*Where rights secured by the Constitution are involved, there can be no rule making or legislation, which would abrogate them*" Miranda v. Arizona 384 U.S. 436, 491.
12. Based on customary international laws, the 5th Amendment of the Constitution for the United States of America, which guarantees due process of the law and Article IV of the same Constitution Section 1; Full

Faith and Credit shall be given in each State to the public Acts, Records and judicial proceedings of every other state...

RELIEF SOUGHT

1. **The Enforcement of the following:** Article VI of the United States Constitution (Republic); The Treaty of Peace and Friendship of EIGHTEEN HUNDRED and THIRTY-SIX (1836) A.D. - Article VI and XX; CONSULAR NOTIFICATION AND ACCESS MANUAL Fifth Edition September 2018 in regards to Foreign Nationals/Non-U.S. Citizens; Common Law Trademark Laws in regards to my FICTITIOUS BUSINESS/ESTATE (DEMARIO LASHUN HANKINS); General Assembly resolution 60/147; General Assembly resolution 61/295 Article 15 et al; United States Statutes at Large Volume 66 Stat 238 Section 308, 8 U.S. Code § 1401(b), Title 18 USC 1091, et cetera.
2. Immediately hold all Actors/Defendants accountable in accordance with **“26 USC 7201: Attempt to evade or defeat tax”** for not reporting the 1099 original issue discount (OID) from my ESTATE/TRUST for all taxes and penalties due to the beneficiary, and for the unlawful financial transactions taken place by Defendants. To pay all penalties under **“26 USC 7206: Fraud and false statements”** for **false statements** submitted on their records against me and my ESTATE/TRUST.
3. For all Defendants to Report any Cash Payments Over \$10,000 in their operations of Trade and Business to the Internal Revenue Service and the Financial Crimes Enforcement Network in all efforts to combat money laundering as required by law on Form 8300. *“Civil and criminal penalties may apply if you fail to file Form 8300 and provide a written statement to each person named on Form 8300. Penalty amounts are adjusted annually for inflation.”* Source: <https://www.irs.gov/businesses/small-businesses-self-employed/form-8300-and-reporting-cash-payments-of-over-10000>.
4. For said Defendants, alleging to be the “qualified heirs” and “holder in due course” of my ESTATE, in accordance with **26 USC 2032A(e)(11)** to put up their BONDS, provide their receipt and tax-exempt status from the Secretary of Puerto Rico as required by law, or hold all Defendants 100 percent liable for the TAX of this matter and R.I.C.O Scheme operation(s). **(11) Bond in lieu of personal liability** *“If the qualified heir makes written application to the Secretary for determination of the maximum amount of the additional tax which may be imposed by subsection (c) with respect to the qualified heir's interest, the Secretary (as soon as possible, and in any event within 1 year after the making of such application) shall notify the heir of such maximum amount. The qualified heir, on furnishing a bond in such amount and for such period as may be required, shall be discharged from personal liability for any additional tax imposed by subsection (c) and shall be entitled to a receipt or writing showing such discharge.”*
5. To pay the beneficiary (minister demar-lashun: bey) of the said ESTATE/CESTUI QUE VIE TRUST, and dismiss all frivolous charges brought against my ESTATE/TRUST.
6. To appoint all Defendants as **Fiduciary Trustee's** under the power of appointment act of 1951 in said matter.
7. For the Defendants to **immediately cease and desist** all unlawful collections of DEBTS in accordance with **“15 U.S. Code § 1692e - False or misleading representations”**. The Policy Enforcers who are **clearly** in uniform and have a badge, is in violation of 15 USC 1692e. They **cannot** wear a badge and uniform and be a DEBT collector, neither can the MAGISTRATE be a DEBT collector in violation of Title 15 USC 1692 in the performance of his **fiduciary trustee** duties to The People.

8. To comply with Public Law 73-10, Ch. 48 STAT 48-112, that all alleged DEBTS are prepaid under the emergency banking act of 1933.
9. To comply with Title 18 U.S. Code § 1956 - Laundering of monetary instruments
<https://uscode.house.gov/view.xhtml?req=granuleid:USC-1994-title18-section1956&num=0&edition=1994>
10. To compel the District Attorney to produce the alleged evidence of the liability to the statute.
11. Due Process of Law is demanded as protected by the Fourth (4th) and Fifth (5th) Amendments of the Constitution for the United States of America (Republic).
12. I demand for the United States District Court to stop these unlawful abuses of the colorable authority by the Defendant(s) as it pertains to Petitioner.
13. I demand for the United States District Court view this Petitioner (in my Proper Person) as an Aboriginal-American of Moorish Descent, native Tennessean, non-citizen, non-resident, non-subject, People of the United States of America and not as a (brand) NEGRO, BLACKMAN (person), COLORED, AFRICAN-AMERICAN, or any other SLAVE TITLE or 'nom de guerre' imposed upon me for misrepresentation 'Actions' or other acts of 'Misprison' that a misdirected society may "believe" to be true.
14. **I do not**, under any condition or circumstance, by threat, duress, or coercion, waive any God-giving rights Inalienable or Secured by the Constitution or Treaties, and, hereby demand the United States District Court to fulfill their obligations to preserve my rights and carry out their Judicial Duty in 'Good Faith' by ordering Defendant(s) to be brought before the Law to answer for their criminal and unjust actions.
15. For all UNCONSTITUTIONAL Civil Citations – Summons / Ticket – Civil Suit / (misrepresented) Bill of Exchange: Number **M-34-TR-202201658**, and any other 'Order' or 'Action' associated with it / them, to be dismissed and expunged for the record on it's face and merits; or, otherwise, be brought before a legitimately - delegated, and competent 'Court of Law' of international jurisdiction / venue.
16. I further demand for Cause Number: **M-34-TR-202201658** to be dismissed in accordance with FRCP Rule 12(b)(1) through (7) for Defendant(s); (1) lack of subject-matter jurisdiction, (2) lack of personal jurisdiction, (3) improper venue, (4) insufficient process, (5) insufficient service of process, (6) **failure to state a claim upon which relief can be granted**, (7) failure to join a party under Rule 19, and (8) Defendant(s) lack standing and **substance of law**.
17. For all City, County and State Officials to be informed of the Law of the Land (Constitution) and their obligation to uphold the same and to no longer be excused without action on the part of the Sheriff for violating the same. And to be made cognizance of the recompense of colorable actions on their part, by not adhering to the Law.
18. Any Defendant(s), Corporate or Natural, Party-Claimants; Involvements be found guilty of the charges and shall result in immediate Impeachment and/or Recusal of Office.
19. Defendant STATE OF NEW MEXICO is being sued for \$75,000 for compensatory damages and \$75,000 for punitive damages in its official capacity.
20. Defendant DEMING MAGISTRATE is being sued for \$75,000 for compensatory damages and \$75,000 for punitive damages in its official capacity.

21. Defendant Isabel G. Orona is being sued for \$75,000 for compensatory damages and \$75,000 for punitive damages in her private capacity.
22. Defendant Rene Afe Gaona is being sued for \$75,000 for compensatory damages and \$75,000 for punitive damages in his private capacity.
23. Defendant Daniel Evans is being sued for \$75,000 for compensatory damages and \$75,000 for punitive damages in his private capacity.
24. Defendant Ray W. Baese is being sued for \$75,000 for compensatory damages and \$75,000 for punitive damages in his private capacity.

TRIAL BY JURY OF MY OWN PEERS WAS, AND IS, DEMANDED

I declare under the penalty of perjury under the laws of the United States of America and Almighty God that the above is true and correct to the best of my knowledge and honorable intent. I certify to the best of my personal knowledge, information, and belief this notice of removal is not being presented for any improper purpose, to harass, cause unnecessary delay, or needlessly increase costs of litigation. The factual contentions will have evidentiary support upon further investigation and discovery. Thank you.

Day 28, November, 2022 = 1444 M.C.

God's will be done,

Without Prejudice / Without Recourse / ALL Rights Engaged

By: minister demar-lashun: bey, In Good Faith, UCC 1-308

minister demar-lashun of the family bey, beneficiary and
authorized representative for person DEMARIO LASHUN HANKINS ESTATE
II Corinthians 1:23 | Psalm 83:3 | 43 33 551
[Made Pursuant to Title 28 USCA Section 1746]

Encl: (1) Citations
(2) Case Detail
(3) Challenging Jurisdiction/Declaratory Judgment
(4) New Mexico Inspection of Public Act Request – Exhibit A
(5) Affidavit of Notice of Default – Exhibit C
(6) Demand Cease and Desist – Exhibit D
(7) Receipts / Proof of Delivery
(8) New Mexico Constitution
(9) Title 12 USC 95a(2): Regulation of transactions in foreign exchange of gold and silver; property....
(10) Title 12 USC 411 – Issuance to reserve banks: nature of obligation; redemption
(11) Article One, Section X, Clause One of the Constitution for the United States
(12) Title 18 USC 8: Obligation or other security of the United States defined
(13) CONSULAR NOTIFICATION AND ACCESS MANUAL FIFTH EDITION
(14) FICTITIOUS BUSINESS/TRADEMARK
(15) The Ten Commandments

MEMORANDUM OF LAW | STARE DECISIS

- “A corporation can neither practice law nor hire lawyers to carry on the business of practicing law for it.” – People v. California protective Corp’n, 76 cal app 354, 244 pac. 1089
- The use of the highways for the purpose of travel and transportation is not a mere privilege, but a common and fundamental Right of which the public and the individual cannot be rightfully deprived.” – Chicago Motor Coach vs. Chicago, 169 NE 22; Ligare vs. Chicago, 28 NE 934; Boon vs. Clark, 214 SSW 607; 25 Am. Jur. (1st) Highways Sect. 163.
- “The right of a citizen (or others similarly situated) to travel upon the public highways and to transport his property thereon, by horse-drawn carriage, wagon, or automobile is not a mere privilege which may be permitted or prohibited at will, but a common right which he has under his right to life, liberty, and the pursuit of happiness.” – Slusher v. Safety Coac Transit Co. 229 Ky 731, 17 SW2d 1012, affirmed by the Supreme Court in Thompson v. Smith 154 S.E. 579. (emphasis added).
- “The right to Travel; The right to Mode of Conveyance; The Right to Locomotion are all absolute Rights, and the Police cannot make void the exercise of rights. State v. Armstead, 60 s. 778, 779, and 781”.
- “The right to Park or Travel is part of the Liberty of which the Natural Person and citizen cannot be deprived without “due process of Law” under the fifth Amendment of the United States Constitution. Kent v. Dulles 357 US 116, 125.”
- “State Police Power extend only to immediate threats to public safety, health, welfare, etc., Michigan v. Duke 266 US, 476 LED. At 449.”
- “Where rights secured by the Constitution are involved, there can be no rule-making or legislation, which would abrogate them. Miranda v. Arizona 384 US 4336, 125.”
- “The claim and exercise of Constitutional Rights cannot be converted into a crime. Miller v. Kansas 230 F 2nd 486, 489.”
- “For a crime to exist, there must be an injured party (Corpus Delicti). There can be no sanction or penalty imposed on one because of this Constitutional right. Serer v. Cullen 481 F. 945.”
- “If any Tribunal (court) finds absence of proof of jurisdiction over a person and subject matter, the case must be dismissed. Louisville v. Motley 2111 US 149, 29S. CT. 42. “The Accuser Bears the Burden of Proof Beyond a Reasonable Doubt.”
- “In Supreme Court case Murdock v. Penn. 319 US 105 “No state shall convert a liberty into a privilege, license it, and attach a fee to it”.
- “If the state converts a liberty into a privilege, the citizen can engage in the right with impunity.” Shuttlesworth v. Birmingham 373 US 26
- Maine v. Thiboutot 448 US 1, 100 SCT 2502 – “Officers of the court have no immunity, when violating a constitutional right from liability. For they are deemed to know the law.”

- If any question of fact or liability be conclusively presumed against him, this is not due process of law, Zeigler v. Railroad Co., 58 Ala. 599.
- All orders or judgments issued by a judge in a court of limited jurisdiction must contain the findings of the court showing that the court has subject-matter jurisdiction, not allegations that the court has jurisdiction. In re Jennings, 68 Ill.2d 125, 368 N.E.2d 864 (1977) ("in a special statutory proceeding an order must contain the jurisdictional findings prescribed by statute.")
- In Interest of M.V., 288 Ill.App.3d 300, 681 N.E.2d 532 (1st Dist. 1997). Without subject-matter jurisdiction, all of the orders and judgments issued by a judge are void under law, and are of no legal force or effect. In Interest of M.V., 288 Ill.App.3d 300, 681 N.E.2d 532 (1st Dist. 1997) ("Every act of the court beyond that power is void".)
- "An unconstitutional statute has been held to confer no authority on, and to afford no protection to, an officer acting thereunder." Also, "Officers cannot be punished for refusing to obey unconstitutional statutes." (CJS 16, sec. 101, p. 479) "Such laws are in legal contemplation, as inoperative as though they had never been passed or as if the enactment had never been written, and are regarded as invalid or void from the date of enactment, and not only from the date on which it is judicially declared unconstitutional. Such a law generally binds no one, confers no rights, affords No Protections, and imposes no duties, and compliance therewith is unnecessary." (CJS 16, p. 469).
- "No one is bound to obey an unconstitutional law and no courts are bound to enforce it." – 16 Am Juris 2nd, Sec 177 late 2d, Sec 256.
- "The State cannot diminish rights of the People." – Hurtado v. California, 110 U.S. 516.
- "The state is a people and not the created form of government." – Texas v. White, 7 Wallace, 700-74.
- "The individual may stand upon constitutional rights. He is entitled to carry on his private business in his own way. His power to contract is unlimited. He owes no duty to the state or to his neighbors to divulge his business or to open his door to an investigation, so far as it may tend to incriminate him. He owes no such duty to the State, since he receives nothing therefrom, beyond the protection of his life and property. His rights are such as existed by the Law of the Land, long antecedent to the organization of the state... He owes nothing to the public so long as he does not trespass upon their rights." Hale v. Henkel, 201 U.S. 43 (1905).
- "The makers of the Constitution conferred, as against the government, the Right to be let alone; the most comprehensive of rights, and the right most valued by civilized men." – United States Supreme Court Justice Brandeis in Olmstead v. United States (1928).
- "To give such proceedings any validity, there must be a tribunal competent by its constitution - that is by the law of its creation—to pass upon the subject-matter of the suit; and if that involves merely a determination of the personal liability of the defendant, he must be brought within its jurisdiction, obey service of process within the state, or his voluntary appearance. Pennoyer v. Neff, 95 U.S. 733, 24 L.Ed. 565."

minister demar-lashun: bey
 care of 2311 Ranch Club Road #171
 Silver City Territory, New Mexico] Republic
 Zip Exempt

PLACE STICKER AT TOP OF ENVELOPE TO THE RIGHT
 OF THE RETURN ADDRESS. FOLD AT DOTTED LINE

CERTIFIED MAIL®



7022 0410 0002 6236 5

U.S. OFFICIAL MAIL US POSTAGE
 PENALTY FOR
 PRIVATE USE
 \$300
 REDATE

Mailed From 85364
 11/30/2022
 032A 0061852629



U.S. District Court

District of New Mexico

100 N. Church Street, Suite
 Las Cruces, NM, 88001



POSTAL SERVICE®

For Domestic and International Use

Label 107R, May 2014

RECEIVED
 STATES DISTRICT
 CRUCES, NEW MEXICO
 DEC 03 2022
 MELLER, ELIFING
 CLERK OF COURT